

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the 26 September 2006 Office Action. Responsive to that Office Action, Claim 1 is further amended to clarify certain language to avoid potential inconsistency with the Drawings. The correction further clarifies the Claim's recitations thereby.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated allowance of the pending Claims and therefore closed prosecution on the merits in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*. More specifically, the Examiner objected to the Drawings and certain of the Claims on the basis that the wording of Claims 1 and 3 appear to require a parallel arrangement between a resistor and light emitting device, though the Drawings illustrate a series arrangement thereof.

It is believed that the amendment of Claim 1 incorporated hereby obviates the Examiner's formal concerns by removing the potential confusion and possible inconsistency with the Drawings. As for Claim 3, the wording in question is not found in the Claim. Withdrawal of the objection as to Claim 3 or further clarification in that regard is therefore respectfully requested.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If lingering formal concerns remain in light of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney, at the telephone number below, for expedient resolution.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 11 / 16 / 2006

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586